DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 525 IR 007 025

AUTHOR Sinclair, Dorothy
TITLE The "SAFARI" Method of Collection Study and Cooperative Acquisition for a Multi-Library Cooperative. A Manual of Procedures.
INSTITUTION Cleveland Area Metropolitan Library System, Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 64p.; Best copy available
AVAILABLE FROM Cleveland Area Metropolitan Library System, 11000 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44106 ($2.00; paper copy)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperative Programs; Data Collection; Evaluation Methods; *Library Acquisition; *Library Collections; *Library Cooperation; Library Materials; Library Networks; Library Programs; *Program Development; Program Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Site Appraisal for Area Resources Inventory

ABSTRACT

This document examines the importance and difficulties in resource sharing and acquisition by libraries and introduces the procedures of the Site Appraisal for Area Resources Inventory (SAFARI) system as a method of comparative evaluation of subject collections among a group of libraries. Resource, or collection, sharing offers specific advantages, including costs, fast delivery, ease of direct user referral, and opportunities for regular conferences. The SAFARI method, which was designed to evaluate collections among a variety of types of area libraries for resource sharing, identifies topics to be studied, assembles statistical information, checks holdings, and sends a team of experts (faculty and librarians) into the member libraries to make a site appraisal and identify subject strengths. A detailed subject index and library profiles are published for member libraries. This procedures manual provides information on selecting a SAFARI topic, team selection, identification of libraries, procedures planning, information collection, and report preparation and distribution. Appended are sample forms and reports, and the Higher Education Act, Title II-B grant abstract and proposal. (CWM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED168525

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE "SAFARI" METHOD OF COLLECTION STUDY & COOPERATIVE ACQUISITION FOR A MULTI-LIBRARY COOPERATIVE

A MANUAL OF PROCEDURES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nancy Wareham

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

BY

Dorothy Sinclair, Ph.D.
Professor of Library Science, CWRU
Executive Secretary, CAMLS 1975-1977

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

CLEVELAND AREA METROPOLITAN LIBRARY SYSTEM
1977

IR007025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I 1
Collection Study for a Library Cooperative

Section II 7
Questions and Answers

Section III 11
SAFARI Procedures

Appendix A 25
Sample Forms

Appendix B 33
Sample Pages from Reports

Appendix C 50
HEA Title II-B Grant Proposal

I. COLLECTION STUDY FOR A LIBRARY COOPERATIVE

Importance of Resource Sharing

Resource sharing among libraries is coming increasingly to the fore as necessary and desirable. Lip service has been given for some years to the proposition that no library can be self-sufficient, but not until recently have studies been made to suggest how infrequently large proportions of large libraries are, indeed, used. Granted that some library, or group of libraries taken together, should have these frequently used items, we are nevertheless, with some reluctance, approaching the time when we accept the fact that one of those last-resort libraries need not be our own.

For the extremely specialized item, there has been no embarrassment about requesting interlibrary loans, often from libraries at a considerable distance. Now we are moving (while we continue to improve remote access through OCLC and other networks) toward looking at collections regionally rather than institutionally. "Our resources" may no longer be those in our own specific library building, but those of the cooperative group to which our institution belongs. Items we formerly felt we must have in our own collections are now deemed to be accessible if held by a neighboring institution not far away, with whom we have an agreement. Thus, in addition to the very specialized items which we borrow from a distance - even across a continent or an ocean - we have a second line of items held nearer home, to which our access is assured and made as convenient as possible.

Difficulties in Resource Sharing

These changes in attitude and practice do not come easily. Librarians for many years have felt that their own prestige was a reflection of the size and depth of their collections. College and university catalogs have stressed collection size, and accrediting agencies have considered it a major item in evaluating an academic institution. It is scarcely to be expected that directors of our larger libraries will welcome the idea of interdependence on an everyday basis, or be anything but shocked at first at the suggestion that a neighboring library - perhaps even a smaller neighbor - may be able to supply items not held in the larger collection. Even less likely to be content with such an arrangement is the faculty-member who is accustomed to request with assurance of a favorable response the addition of any item to his institution's collection. No one wishes to move from affluence to a state of comparative poverty, even when "poverty" is defined as giving up the second yacht!

When, however, the need to retrench is reluctantly accepted, cooperation at a local level becomes the easiest of the hard alternatives to tolerate. Among the advantages are:

Opportunities for regular conferences at various levels.
Speedy delivery or the potential for such.
Possibility of very fast emergency delivery.
Costs of communication (telephone, teletype, telecopier) lower because of the short distances involved.
Ease of direct referral of users to neighboring collections.

These advantages must, of course, be translated into realities. A formal cooperative among neighboring libraries must be formed to assure that the conferences, deliveries, communications, and referrals to collections actually come into being. With these kinds of reassurance, directors recognize that they have made the best possible arrangement short of ownership. They accept, too, the manifest proposition that, if collection building must be curtailed, the curtailment should be done jointly, according to a plan, with their colleagues in the cooperative.

Information Needed

Conferences, communication, delivery, and referral agreements (Infopass or equivalent) are relatively easy to bring about. The inevitable problems can be worked out and an effective procedure for resource sharing developed. These arrangements, however, constitute only the necessary beginnings of true resource sharing. A group of libraries has formed itself into a cooperative: this group varies in size, type of library, clientele served, policies, value systems. It varies especially in collections - if it does not, resource sharing becomes an empty phrase. It is commonly assumed, especially by the staff and administrators of the largest institutions, that most of the holdings of other, smaller libraries will duplicate those of the largest one(s). As a corollary, it is assumed that resource sharing will be unilateral, from a large collection to a small one but seldom in the other direction.

Is this assumption always a fact? How can a cooperating group of libraries learn:

What are its total resources?
How much greater are these total resources than those of the largest library or libraries?
Are there unique or unusual items or collections in smaller libraries?
Given its total resources, and assuming their distribution has been to some extent determined, how best can the cooperating group develop procedures to share?

And, finally, the "bottom line" question:

Can the group manage to arrive at agreements leading to planned cooperation in acquisition of materials in the future?

Background of the SAFARI Method: CAMLS

The SAFARI method was developed by the Cleveland Area Metropolitan Library System in 1975-77 as a beginning step toward answering some of these questions about its own members and their resources. The System includes:

One very large and prestigious public library.
One good-sized and fast-developing county library system.
Several good medium-sized public libraries.
One older private university with strong retrospective collections.
One new university growing fast and well-supported.

One university with limited graduate programs.
One very strong liberal arts college with a music specialty and conservatory.
A smaller four-year college, also with a conservatory and music specialty.
A former secretarial college broadening its scope.
A large community college with three campuses and several specialties in its AA program.
A medical library.
A theological library.

All are within reasonable commuting distance. Cooperation in interlibrary loan (communication, delivery) was established and an office set up with assistance from the State Library of Ohio from Library Services and Construction Act (Title III) funds in the Fall of 1975. Of more direct importance to the SAFARI program, however, was a grant received in August of 1976 from the U.S. Office of Education under the Higher Education Act (Title IIB). The proposal which led to the grant is included as Appendix II.

A basic assumption behind the SAFARIs in CAMLS was that resources would be distributed among the membership. No doubt the large libraries would have the largest collections and would hold more unique items (unique for the group) than others. Nevertheless, it was expected that collection study would repay the effort by unearthing strong individual caches of subject materials in libraries other than the "giants" among the membership. This assumption was based on several probabilities. First, the variations in clientele and objectives among the member libraries seemed likely to be reflected in variations in philosophy in collection development. Secondly, some of the members might, over the years, have received substantial gift collections from scholars, hobbyists, etc. Thirdly, many of the academic institutions and also the larger public libraries had received special grants from time to time which enabled them to acquire research collections in narrow subjects. And lastly, the academic members' curricula and faculty over the years might have changed so that unsuspected collections bought for no-longer-offered courses might be held. An outstanding example of the last point is the old but rich collection in religion and theology held at Oberlin College, which formerly included a seminary. This fact is known at Oberlin, but not necessarily among the public at large or the staffs of cooperating libraries in CAMLS.

Methods of Collection Study: Individual Libraries

Methods used for studying the collection of an individual library are not always appropriate when one is attempting to identify subject strengths in the resources of a cooperating group of institutions. The public library's collection will be evaluated in terms of community characteristics and needs, on the basis of educational, occupational, regional, and demographic information, often supplemented by various methods of questioning a sample of users and non-users and agencies serving them in other professional capacities. The academic institution's resources are commonly studied in terms of curriculum and research interests of faculty and graduate students. In both cases, of course, appropriate bibliographies may be checked, but the selection of these, as well as the evaluation of results, is based strongly on specifics of the local situation.

None of these methods suffices for the consortium or system of libraries. Not only are different types of institutions - and thus user groups - involved, making it difficult to provide a composite needs assessment. Not only are there problems of communication among types of libraries, making it perilous to attempt to put together the individual need assessments and selection/acquisitions policies without further inspection and clarification. The basic difference lies in the purpose of the cooperative, as compared with the individual institution. The individual institution develops its collection to serve its own objectives and its own clientele. It adds what it needs most frequently, or most urgently according to its value system. It joins a cooperative in order to be able to extend its resources beyond these immediate parameters - to provide for the infrequently called for item, specialized beyond the institution's emphases, expensive beyond the institution's budget resources. It needs a method of answering legitimate, often highly important requests which it would be totally unjustified in meeting from its own resources. These needs vary according to an institution's objectives. An academic library is well aware of the faculty member or graduate student who requests a variety of specialized resources. The special library has the same experience, but often, too, needs more general materials than its specialty includes. The public library, attempting to supply a variety of society's requirements, may on the one hand need to supply a variety of fifty-year old fiction for a group of older readers in a nursing home, or for a scholar studying the popular works of the period, or, on the other, may be the only library for the use of the inventor, the new entrepreneur beginning a business, or the government of its jurisdiction. Each of these groups may well have information needs which go beyond the needs of the individual collection.

Methods of Collection Study: Cooperatives

A cooperative's resource sharing, therefore, seeks not necessarily to supply the everyday needs of the institutions which are its members, but the specialized ones which, while legitimate in terms of the institution's objectives, are beyond its legitimate collection-building policies. The cooperative assumes, implicitly if not otherwise, that at least some of these needs can be filled through access to resources of its members. Collection study for a cooperative, therefore, seeks to identify those collections and aspects of collections which are not likely to be known to member library staffs and users, for a variety of reasons:

Simple unfamiliarity with a curriculum or community.
Oversimplified notion of the role of different types of libraries - e.g., assumption that smaller public libraries contain chiefly light fiction, or that academic libraries have not changed since a staff-member's undergraduate days, and are all alike.
Existence of special collections (gifts, former curriculum specialties) unknown except to the staff of the institution itself.

The most used method of identifying the subject strengths among a group of cooperating libraries is simple: libraries are asked to supply information about their subject emphases. This method undoubtedly does locate a number

of special collections. It is an assumption of CAPELS, however, that this method is deficient in the following ways:

It may identify "specialties" in smaller libraries which are not really unusual collections for the group as a whole.
It may fail to identify the group's strongest collections in a number of subject areas, because they are held by large libraries which do not consider them major holdings.
It tends to provide information in general terms. Broad subjects rather than narrower sub-subjects may be identified, e.g., Management rather than Operations Research or Personnel Management (which may be held respectively by an academic and large public library, each of which will report a Management collection).

Collection study is a fairly expensive proposition, even for one library. It is also a long-range activity. A cooperative beginning to set up its interlibrary loan procedures, its Infopass program (for referring users to other collections) may wish to identify at least some of the important subject strengths immediately, even though it may plan later to embark on more ambitious study in depth. It may also need, as soon as possible, to plan for cooperative acquisition, in the face of increasing costs and shrinking budgets. For all these purposes, it needs first to locate the strengths on which to build.

Quantitative methods give a rough approximation of strengths. Shelflists can be measured, entries in catalogs under certain classifications and subject-headings counted. Samplings of recent orders can be compared. Each of these methods has its value, and its shortcomings. Variations in classification, cataloging, and timing of acquisition are obvious limitations. Nevertheless, a cooperative embarking on resource sharing in practice will wish the assistance of even these types of information. The quantitative type of collection study, then, is one which can be utilized for a cooperative as well as for study of an individual collection. Another is the checking of appropriate bibliographies. And a third is the examination of collections by an expert.

The CAPELS Method combines these three latter methods. It identifies topics to be studied, assembles statistical information, checks holdings, and sends a team of experts (faculty and librarians) into the member libraries to make a site appraisal. This Manual is prepared, as part of the terms of the Grant, (received by CAPELS from the U.S. Office of Education under the Higher Education Act, Title IIB) for the use of any consortium, system or council which wishes to try the method.

[illegible]

1. What is a CAFWOG?

CAFWOG (Site Appraisal for Area Resources Assessment) is a method of comparative evaluation of subject collections among a group of libraries.

The chief method is a series of on-site visits to libraries in a community, Bureau, Council, or other cooperative which are believed to be strong in the subject field being studied.

One subject field only is studied by each CAFWOG team.

The team is made up of subject specialists including library staffs and faculty-members of participating institutions.

2. What is the advantage of the CAFWOG method?

Cooperating libraries need to have more mature subject strengths like. The usual method of asking for subject "specialties" has several limitations:

> Replies are geared to "specialties" within a particular library's total collection. What seems to be, and is, a specialty to the person may be far surpassed by another, larger member library which will not consider itself as specialties in the subject concerned.
>
> Specialties as listed in directories compiled through questionnaires usually are rather general.

The CAFWOG method attempts to identify specialties with regard to the comparables, i.e., the strongest collections in rather specific aspects of the subject studied.

3. What are the CAFWOG's products?

The chief product is the CAFWOG Report. It includes:

> Through a 6-called subject index, topics in the field studied and identifications of the libraries strongest in each.
>
> Profiles of the libraries with strong collections, giving statistics (titles, journals, etc.), hours, name of a contact person, telephone number. Special aspects of each library's collection, in as much detail as possible, are given here.

Re-processing frequently includes other cooperative activities and aspects of the CAFWOG team. Subject specialties libraries are pleased to become acquainted with one another, and frequently plan future informal meetings. Personal acquaintances of this sort (like the Special Libraries Association "Old Boy" Network) lead to many valuable, though informal, cooperative plans.

Additional publications may emerge as a result of the CAFWOG. Union lists are a common offshoot.

4. What conditions are necessary for a successful SAFARI?

   Existence of some sort of core nucleus among a group of librarians.

   Willingness of library directors to permit staff to participate.

   Recognition of the importance of collection study, especially identification of subject strengths.

   An interested, enthusiastic SAFARI team, made up of librarians with subject specialties, and (not necessarily but highly desirable) faculty members of participating institutions.

   Reasonable driving distance among the member libraries. It is best to consider if a SAFARI which entailed driving long distances.

   Willingness of member libraries to be visited, to receive the team, to help/share the collection, and to answer questions. Generally, the best is because an avid visited library to a SAFARI member.

   Libraries of a size which permits absence of a specific staff member for 3-5 days, not necessarily consecutive. Non-research oriented libraries may not be able to participate as members, although this would not preclude their being visited.

5. How is the Report of a SAFARI team useful to the participating libraries

   As a directory for referral of users to member libraries' collections.

   As a help in determining where to seek for an interlibrary loan.

   As a guide in determining which member library to call:

      When one wish to locate a particular item for a user.
      When one is considering a major purchase and need to know whether another participating library intends to purchase it.
      When one wish to satisfy other interested member libraries of major acquisitions in the field - e.g., receipt of an important gift.
      When one can offered a gift inappropriate for your library but of potential value if added to an already-strong collection.

   As a basis for cooperative acquisitions agreements.

6. How does the SAFARI Method assist in developing cooperative acquisitions?

   It identifies strengths to build on for the cooperative as a whole.

   It moves into cooperative acquisitions gradually, step by step.

   It identifies strengths to shelf enough copies that the resource libraries of the cooperative, in various subjects and sub-subjects, will not all be the largest ones.

It is non-threatening in the sense that it does not put pressure on any library to make major changes in its purchasing patterns.

It does not invest a great deal of time in a major plan for cooperative acquisition which may not be acceptable. SAFARI Method has other products which are useful even if the cooperative acquisition aspect is slow to develop.

III. SAFARI PROCEDURES

Basic Procedures

1. Select SAFARI Topic
2. Select SAFARI Team. Include librarians and faculty
3. Identify Libraries to be Visited
4. Plan SAFARI Route, Procedures, Ground-Rules
5. Collect Quantitative and Other Information from Libraries to be Represented
6. Undertake the SAFARI Visits
7. Plan and Prepare the SAFARI Report
8. Distribute and Use the Report

Specific Procedures

I. Selecting the SAFARI Topic

Appoint, or utilize an existing committee (Planning Committee)
Include the individual from each participating library of consortium, system, or council who is most familiar with total library resources

Include also the director, coordinator, chairperson of the cooperating group, if one exists

Make a list of topics which are either:
Represented in some depth in a number of participating libraries, OR
Types which would be listed as subject emphases in a directory of these, OR
Areas of current interest and/or importance
(Note that some topics will meet all three of these criteria)

If desired, ask for input from member library personnel (Planning Committee)
Send memo
Inquire through Newsletter, if any

Vote on resulting topics and prepare a list in priority order (Planning Committee)

COMMENTARY: Examples of appropriate topics

A new advanced degree program may be undertaken. While the institution offering this new program will, of course, build its own collection in the field, it will be wise to do so with as much knowledge as possible of the resources in the cooperative. It may, thereby, avoid unnecessary duplication and possibly be able to add to the group's total resources materials not held elsewhere.

Several institutions in a cooperative may receive grants in a subject of special current importance, e.g., environmental study. The grants may be quite specific, and differentiated, but there is a danger that unnecessary duplication may occur unless there is consultation and agreement. Such consultation can also result in permanent ownership, by individual group members, of more and better total collections in this special field.

A topic requiring use of a variety of special resources may suddenly come into prominence. An example is the great increase in interest in genealogy as a result of the publication and filming of Roots. Public libraries are especially affected, but other, too, may feel the influence of this demand. Materials needed are costly, many are rare, many scarce. Some are unique manuscript materials. A SAFARI report on this topic locates special local history and genealogy materials among the members, and stresses conditions of use and availability.

II. Selecting the SAFARI Team (Planning Committee)

Identify libraries with assumed or known strengths in the topic selected

Recruit from each the librarian with most knowledge of the collection in the topic selected, and of its use

Recruit if possible, at least one interested and knowledgeable faculty member from academic libraries

Determine whether other special libraries, not members of the cooperative group, shall be invited to participate.

Invite special library participation, if decision is favorable

COMMENTARY: Staff members

The team should contain a neutral leader or convener, whose function is to assist with arrangements, keep the group on schedule, keep the work moving according to its objectives. Such a group of specialists may move off into fascinating byways (which have their own value and may well be pursued later) not relevant to the purpose at hand.

It is also desirable that the team include at least one generalist, who may also be the neutral leader. This member is especially important when the report is in preparation, and the purpose is to avoid use of over-specialized terminology in the subject index. The Report will be used by general libraries and their users.

If time and space permit, there is no objection to the inclusion of any staff member of any cooperating library who may wish to participate in order to learn more about resources.

Librarians (and faculty members) from non-member libraries may be invited to participate, if the group's policy permits. Such participation is of special value when the topic explored is one for which there are many special collections outside the cooperating group. For example, a SAFARI on local history may invite persons connected with many small, semi-private or private collections. An Art SAFARI would no doubt gain from the presence of the librarian of the local Art Museum, even if the institution is not a member of the cooperative.

Librarians who participate are likely to come from two groups: public service librarians in departmental or subject libraries, of any type and acquisitions specialists, collection development librarians, or bibliographers in academic institutions. It is desirable that both groups be well represented - the former for their knowledge not only of their own collections, but also of what used, what is asked for, and the latter for their overall acquaintance with the topic surveyed. As was noted above, however, the Report must be public-service oriented.

The problem of major non-participating libraries

Occasionally a library of importance cannot participate in the SAFARI team. This is unfortunate, and is to be avoided if possible. Nevertheless, in a voluntary cooperative of autonomous members, it can happen. In such a case, it is usually possible to include the library concerned in the SAFARI visits, and to obtain information for the library's profile in the Report.

Occasionally a topic is chosen which involves libraries with such small staffs that a team cannot be gathered. In CAMLS, this situation occurred when the subject of Nursing was studied. Libraries were chiefly small specialized ones in hospitals. whose librarians were unable to get away for a series of visits. In such a case, a Report is developed without visits. Technically, this is not a SAFARI by definition (no site appraisal), but the Nursing Report is included in the CAMLS SAFARI series.

Obtaining faculty members for SAFARI team

Acquaintance of library staff and faculty varies from institution to institution. Library staff may, or may not, be in a position to identify appropriate faculty participants. Subject specialist librarians who are in frequent professional contact with faculty in the same fields, on the other hand, may be able not only to identify, but also to request faculty participation.

The approach may have to be made at another level. The Library Director may approach a department head, at least to the extent of opening a door for a specialist librarian's interview.

In some academic institutions, an official who is neither a librarian nor a faculty member, but who has a coordinating role in the college or university, may be approached by the Library Director, and asked to assist in obtaining faculty participation.

After the first experience of a faculty member's participation, it becomes easier to persuade faculty. This statement assumes that the experience was a good one. CAMLS experience is that faculty members, once persuaded to participate, find the activity rewarding. If, through normal communication channels, SAFARI participation is publicized in the institution, it is gradually accepted as a normal faculty activity.

Faculty participation frequently affects the schedule of the SAFARI visits, but it is worth the effort to make necessary adjustments. It is not recommended that faculty-members be partial team members, visiting only some libraries. Their input may be obtained by the institution's library team member before the Report meeting.

CAMLS has prepared a brief description of the SAFARI concept, and the value of faculty participation, which may be adapted by libraries wishing to try the method. See Appendix I.

III. Identifying Libraries to be Visited

Consider whether libraries represented on the team all need to be visited. Discuss collections generally for this purpose

Consider whether other libraries should be added

(In general, the preliminary work of the Planning Committee will have made adequate decisions.)

COMMENTARY: Participation by smaller libraries

All cooperatives contain some libraries that are smaller than others. Whether such libraries should participate, with regard to subjects they themselves feel are stressed in their collections, becomes a problem which tends to work out in practice.

The small library representative may feel embarrassed or apologetic when visited after several larger collections have been examined.

Representatives of larger libraries may feel that they will be wasting time examining small collections.

Both types of apprehension may prove groundless when a small library does, in fact, contain a real specialty, even if it is a very small one. Examples in CAMLS experience: Curriculum libraries in smaller colleges; Popular music recordings in smaller public libraries.

Smaller special libraries may, of course, contain much material of extreme value to the cooperative.

After experience in the SAFARI method, smaller libraries may become more selective with regard to participation. For example:

They may decide not to participate. It should never be considered necessary that every library in a cooperative do so.

They may decide to send an observer, but not participate on the team and not be visited. These options should be open.

They may decide to contribute a profile to the Report, without again being visited. See Appendix I for examples.

Small and general libraries, which will benefit to some degree from the Reports, whether or not they participate, may be asked to provide the necessary generalist viewpoint for the Report. (See Procedures, page 13.)

IV. Planning the SAFARI Route, Procedures, Ground Rules (SAFARI Team)

Set up a Planning Meeting for the SAFARI Team, to determine the following: Route, Transportation, and Timing

Arrange for car-pooling
Arrange a starting place which has parking, where car-pools can meet and disperse
Determine how long the SAFARI Team should visit each library
Divide the visits into days, on the basis of geography and time to be spent at each library
Estimate driving time between stops, lunch break
Make a schedule for each of 2 or 3 days (normal length)
Set dates convenient to team members, not too far apart
Arrange for parking at libraries to be visited, if possible

Procedures

Determine quantitative and other information needed for Report, along with site appraisals
Arrange for the collection of this information (individual team members)
Decide on procedure for site visits, including assignment of specific sub-topics or forms of material to be looked for by each member
Set date for report meeting, about a week after the last visit

Ground Rules

Do not permit tours of visited libraries
Do not permit refreshments to be served at visited libraries

COMMENTARY: Finding time for the SAFARI effort

The time problem is twofold: (1) Obtaining acceptance by Directors and supervisors of the team's absence from their desks for the actual SAFARI visits and two or three other team meetings, and (2) Keeping the time used down to a minimum. The two are inter-related. Supervisors are more likely to accept shorter and fewer absences.

From the viewpoint of the supervisor:

Importance of the effort must be recognized -- for all participating libraries.

Supervisors may not be aware of details of the program, and its several objectives. Directors may have accepted the principle at meetings, but failed to communicate sufficiently with supervisors.

Supervisors of general libraries, with sizable but not outstanding collections in several fields for which SAFARIs are undertaken, may feel that they should supply team-members for each, but also feel that the amount of time is unreasonable. Such Directors should be

encouraged to be selective in deciding which SAFARIs they will participate in.

It is hoped that this Manual may assist cooperating groups of libraries which wish to try the SAFARI method to explain what is involved, and the long-range benefits to which the SAFARIs will contribute.

From the viewpoint of the team:

Meeting with other specialists, especially other librarians, is a stimulating and professionally satisfying experience. The team is likely to spend committee meeting time on matters irrelevant to the SAFARI itself, unless the convener keeps them to the task at hand.

Team members tend to wish to spend a good deal of time on preliminary preparations and checkings. While these types of information (quantitative listings, spot checks) are a valuable part of the Report, and although the team should briefly identify what types of objective information are needed, this decision should be made as quickly as possible, and data need not be collected by the SAFARI teams or completed before the SAFARI takes place in most cases.

From the viewpoint of the cooperative's benefits:

A SAFARI team's ability to compare collections requires that there not be too much time between visits. Two or three days within a week seems to work best. The Report meeting seems to be best scheduled about a week after the final visit.

In an actual situation, these three types of interest, which tend to conflict, must be resolved by compromise. If a team wishes to continue to meet, and to undertake other cooperative efforts after the SAFARI, this is a separate and distinct venture and not part of the SAFARI method proper. Teams seem almost always to want to make union lists. Whether or not they do so, and how the work is divided, becomes a separate matter for the libraries concerned. It should not be considered, insofar as time spent is concerned, a part of the SAFARI program.

V. Collecting Quantitative & Other Information for the Report

Begin collecting information (as agreed on at Planning Meeting) as soon as possible after the Planning Meeting (SAFARI team delegate to staff).

Do not wait until the visits begin.

Continue, if necessary, to have information collected during and shortly after the visits.

Have information completed, at latest, for the Report Planning meeting, approximately a week after the last visit.

Do not distribute information prior to the SAFARI visits.

If complete information can be given to each team member at a library when it is visited.

Do not attempt, through such information, to pre-judge collections to be visited.

COMMENTARY: Checking lists as a preliminary to SAFARI visits

CAMLS, being in Ohio, is fortunate that almost all its members, of all types, are members of OCLC. It was therefore possible to check recent, non-retrospective bibliographies on that data base for almost all members at once with a tremendous saving in time. Other cooperatives may have similar access to OCLC, BALLOTS, or some other data base showing holdings. Some may have union catalogs. If these types of facilities are not available, it is desirable to hold checking to a reasonable limit, in order to avoid the need to use too much staff time and thus place too heavy a burden on member libraries.

VI. The SAFARI Visits (SAFARI Team)

Meet at the convening place.

Separate into car pools, as agreed.

Visit the first library (normally this is the convening place).

Explain (team member from visited library, or other host/hostess) locations, general policy and philosophy of the library and of the collection in the topic to be studied (brief).

Separate, and spend most of visit time examining the collection (team).

Come to the collection with an open mind; avoid preconceptions.

Concentrate on the assigned topic or form, but do not do so to the extent of failing to obtain an overview of the special collection topic studied.

Investigate catalogs, shelves, journal lists and shelves, reference materials, exercise, special files, documents, other appropriate materials, including audio-visual.

Take fairly full notes on collection, one page for each library (more if necessary).

In second and later visits, compare collections in notes, as specifically as possible.

Ask the team member from the visited library, or host/hostess, any questions necessary to clarify impressions.

Be sure to see all relevant materials, including those in storage or other special location. Be aware of classification quirks (local team member's responsibility).

Meet at the entrance or other designated point at time scheduled for departure.

Visit libraries in turn, and repeat procedures, according to schedule.

Do not revise the schedule en route unless it is absolutely necessary; make a firm commitment to adhere to schedule.

Make the visit a business trip, not a pleasure trip.

VII. Planning & Preparing the Report

Meet at an agreed-upon central spot about a week after the completion of the visits (Entire Team).

Comment in turn on libraries, in order visited (Entire Team; the convener is in the chair).

Take notes on comments as pronounced (Team Generalist).

Discuss any disagreements; arrive at consensus.

Utilize the representative of the library under discussion as a resource person, for objective information.

For each library, read and agree upon the strengths to be identified, and the general tenor of the description of the library's nature and function, if one is to be included.

Identify strongest collections which may become resource libraries.

Determine how the Report shall be organized.

Identify, at least in principle, subject-headings to be used in the subject-access section.

Determine what additional information shall be included in library profile. (This decision has already been made, tentatively, and information has been gathered, or is being gathered)

Assign one member, perhaps the generalist, to prepare the report.

Give or send to this person the notes taken at this meeting, plus information gathered for library profiles.

Prepare report in draft form, and send to members of team for review (Generalist or assigned team member preparing report).

Receive drafts with approval or suggestions, compile final report for duplication and distribution (Team member).

COMMENTARY: Arriving at consensus as to subject

Consensus may be easy or hard to arrive at. There may be some disagreement. While the convener is in the chair, the team members are the experts. It is probable that disagreements will form themselves out to ways which are profitable to the report. For example, the first speaker may say that Library X seems weak in this topic. Others may challenge the statement, instancing strong holdings in an aspect of the topic, or journals, or a special file of unique materials. Thus, special strengths are identified for the report, even though the original speaker may be correct in the statement of overall weakness. Discussion of this type is fruitful and should be prolonged as long as valuable contributions to the Report are forthcoming.

Organization of the Report, Subject Headings

The term system, after discussion of individual libraries and amongst collections in search of the DATAS topic, how the report shall be organized. Subject headings for the subject access part of the report are considered, at least in principle. Here, it is important that the committee prevent the waste of non-specific uses of the report, and avoid use of "in-group" terms only. There is no objection, in the subject access section, to use of synonymous headings (which might even redundant in a catalog). In most cases, cross-references are not needed; it is simpler to duplicate headings in both places. In other words, the normal restrictions of material control libraries should be avoided. The subject access section, in brief, is to be used, is should be simple and useful to the non-specialist, including the library user as well as the staff. Jargonized terms in common use -- hard as they are for the cataloger to accept -- can be used here along with proper subject headings. Especially, it is necessary to avoid using any classification scheme for the subject access section. This practice tends to promote a classified list, rather than specific subjects. It also tends to bury small topics not covered specifically in the classification used. Any tendency to divide the subject access section along the lines of assigned topics for the DATAS static should also be scrutinized with care, to make sure it is the best method. The subject access section should resemble an index, not a table of contents.

Organization of Library Profiles

It is not wise to attempt to fix the library profiles into pre-prepared forms. The buyers's form and emphasis should arise from the DATAS static. The subject itself will be all probabilities determine the parts of the library profiles which describe collections. If it be felt that time and money will be saved, a form can be made for each individual DATAS's library profile section, a form which will allow for the content to be covered. To try to adjust content to space which may be inadequate is to lose some of the value of the buyers.

Evaluation of Collections

It is essential that collections, no libraries of any size, be evaluated honestly. It constitutes nothing to conjecture, and dilutes the value of the buyers, if the case arises "special collections" where they do not exist. This practice, undertaken with the best intentions of promoting good support, nullifies the whole intent of the DATAS method. It is necessary that all term centers understand this at the outset, both as customers of collections and as users of librarians skilled. Surely professionals must not be offended when their holdings are honestly appraised and objectively described.

While the term "evaluation" has been used in this Manual, it should be clearly understood to be used in a limited sense. The DATAS method aims at one sense of evaluating collections for individual institutions in terms of their own objectives and clientele. Description of a collection as "small" or "general" or "for the non-specialist user" carries with it no criticism, no suggestion that the collection ought to be larger or more specialized. The term is not qualified to make such judgments.

Forwarding SUTARI Type Problem to Reverential Reference Libraries

Some members, especially library staff members, may find that it is not likely possible to make recommendations which may lead to designation of one or more libraries as the cooperative's reference library or specialized fields. The idea is a one one to many, the responsibility seems over-shadowing and a somewhat presumptuous exercise of an authority that do not promote to their own institutions.

The normative nature of the recommendation should be stressed. The term would identifies what one appears to be the principal collection in a specific field -- not absolutely, but partly established elsewhere in European college catalogs, not every, but considerable field comparable. The identification should be called to the attention of the library Administrator concerned. These, probably after consultation with their own specialists (who may well be SUTARI Team members) agree to accept the responsibility or not, as they wish.

Levels of responsibility are offered to a prospective reference library -- including agreement to undertake to support the collection at the present level. No absolute commitment for the future is expected, although the library is asked to agree to announce any future changes with regard to keeping up the specialty.

UNESCO proposed, and used during the initial studies, the three steps to appendix

VIII. Distributing and Using the Report

Identify distributing agency and/or agent (System office, convener, individual preparing report, planning committee, etc.)

Send one copy to each member of the team and planning committee.

Send one copy to each library among the cooperating group, if not already represented above.

Send additional copies to libraries on request, for:

Faculty members of appropriate departments
Prominent user or groups of users, e.g.,
  Education SAFARI Report to Boards of Education,
  school librarians.

Prepare a list of possible uses, and distribute to Planning Committee, e.g.,

Place on shelves adjacent to materials
Place on index tables and stands, near appropriate indexes
Use to identify collections to which to refer users,
  according to the group's agreed-upon procedures
Use to identify potentially profitable interlibrary loan source.
Use as a basis for developing cooperative acquisitions

Send a copy of the Resource Library Agreement (See Appendix I) to any library identified as a possible resource library. Discuss what is involved, and what is not, with the Director or other responsible staff-member.

Notify all cooperating members of Resource Libraries as they are identified.

When a number have been identified, prepare a list and distribute it to members of the cooperative. Keep a list at the office of the cooperative, and encourage all members to call for up-to-date information.

COMMENTARY: Getting Reports and Information into the Right Hands

When Reports and information about Resource Libraries are mailed, they may simply be added to the library collection. If they are handed out to Directors at a meeting, they may be kept in a file in a Director's desk. Some libraries treat the Reports as serials, and file in a place unlikely to result in their use. Branches and departments of libraries may receive the Reports without having been briefed as to their existence and potential use.

An effort to cut mailing costs may thus be a mistake. It is better to mail a number of Reports directly, and to include a form letter introducing the Report and its potential use. Directors, team members, Planning Committee, and all other involved should constitute themselves as a public relations group among member library staffs to assure distribution, understanding, and use.

APPENDIX A

Sample Forms

Appendix A-1 Sample form: Non-CAMLS Member Participation

CLEVELAND AREA METROPOLITAN LIBRARY SYSTEM

11000 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Nancy Wareham, Executive Director
[redacted]
Phone: (216) 368-2642

PARTICIPATION IN THE SAFARI PROGRAM

What is the Cleveland Area Metropolitan Library System?

CAMLS is an organization of libraries in the Cleveland area. It includes public, special, college and university libraries. Its purpose is to develop and facilitate cooperation in sharing library resources and expertise. In these days of budget shrinkage, it is important that all facilities and resources be utilized to the fullest.

CAMLS operates an interlibrary loan service among members, with daily facsimile transmission service and UPS delivery. Under the system, you, or your patrons, may request loans from other member libraries through your own library. These are just a few of the activites in which CAMLS is involved.

What is a SAFARI?

"SAFARI" (Site Appraisal For Area Resources Inventory) is the designation given to a technique CAMLS is using for collective study. Under the general supervision of the Library Resources Committee, topics for collection study are identified. Specialist Librarians - those who serve users and those who are in charge of collection development in the designated subject areas are identified. This group plans and carries out the SAFARI, in which they visit area collections in the specified subject area, evaluating and describing them. After the visits, the SAFARI Team has a session in which notes are compared and consensus taken to arrive at the strengths of each collection. A document is prepared, and published by CAMLS, describing and evaluating the region's bibliographic strength in the subject field studied.

In view of past successful experience, CAMLS encourages continued participation by faculty and by individuals whoses libraries are not members of CAMLS.

Member Libraries - Baldwin-Wallace College; Case Western Reserve University; Cleveland Health Sciences; Cleveland Heights-University Heights Public; Cleveland Public; Cleveland State University; Cuyahoga Community College; Cuyahoga County Public; Dyke College; East Cleveland Public; Euclid Public; John Carroll University; Lakewood Public; Oberlin College; Porter-Westlake Public; Rocky River Public; School of Library Science, CWRU; Shaker Heights Public; St. Mary Seminary; Willoughby-Eastlake Public

CLEVELAND AREA METROPOLITAN LIBRARY SYSTEM

11000 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Nancy Wareham, Executive Director
DOROTHY SINCLAIR, Executive Secretary
Phone: (216) 368-2642

October 1977

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN THE SAFARI PROGRAM

What is the Cleveland Area Metropolitan Library System?

CAMLS is an organization of libraries in the Cleveland area. It includes public, special, college and university libraries. Its purpose is to develop and facilitate cooperation in sharing library resources and expertise. In these days of budget shrinkage, it is important that all facilities and resources be utilized to the fullest.

CAMLS operates an interlibrary loan service among members, with daily facsimile transmission service and UPS delivery. Under the system, you, or your students, may request loans from other member libraries through your own library.

These are just a few of the activities in which CAMLS is involved.

What is a SAFARI?

"SAFARI" (Site Appraisal For Area Resources Inventory) is the designation given to a technique CAMLS is using for collection study. Under the general supervision of the Library Resources Committee, topics for collection study are identified. Specialist Librarians - those who serve users and those who are in charge of collection development in the designated subject areas are identified. This group plans and carries out the SAFARI, in which they visit area collections in the specified subject area, evaluating and describing them. After the visits, the SAFARI Team has a session in which notes are compared and consensus taken to arrive at the strengths of each collection. A document is prepared, and published by CAMLS, describing and evaluating the region's bibliographic strength in the subject field studied.

Faculty Participation

1. Faculty members in their respective disciplines have been participating in the SAFARI Program. So far, they are enthusiastic about the experience, finding it useful for their own work.

Member Libraries - Baldwin-Wallace College; Case Western Reserve University; Cleveland Health Sciences; Cleveland Heights-University Heights Public; Cleveland Public; Cleveland State University; Cuyahoga Community College; Cuyahoga County Public; Dyke College; East Cleveland Public; Euclid Public; John Carroll University; Lakewood Public; Oberlin College; Porter-Westlake Public; Rocky River Public; School of Library Science, CWRU; Shaker Heights Public; St. Mary Seminary; Willoughby-Eastlake Public

2. Advantage of faculty participation:

   - Closer knowledge of library collections in subject field, for research, teaching, and referral of students

   - Availability of the brochures in departments where immediate users will have access to them (faculty participants are urged to request and distribute copies to all interested colleagues)

   - Faculty judgement in recommendation by SAFARI Project to Library Directors via CAMLS for shared responsibilities among member libraries for collection development. Faculty members' awareness of the extent of total area library resources will assist in more intelligent planning.

In view of past successful experiences, CAMLS encourages continued participation by faculty.

CAMLS RESOURCE LIBRARY - DESCRIPTION

One of the main objectives of the Title II-B grant is to study the possibilities of resource sharing in the Cleveland area. The initial step taken was to locate the collections which had specific subject strengths. This has been accomplished in six different fields. The next phase is to have the Directors of those libraries which were determined to be a Resource Library by means of the SAFARI Report in Education to complete the following questionnaire.

SUBJECT STRENGTHS:_____

A CAMLS Resource Library is one which:

1. Has been determined, by a SAFARI Team or other survey, to have the strongest or one of the strongest collections in CAMLS in a subject area or form of material. Generally subjects and forms will be specific rather than general areas.

2. Is willing to agree to continue to collect in this area or form under the following general conditions:

Will do the following (Check one, or more if appropriate):

_____ Collect in more depth than at present, as a strong collection

_____ Collect in approximately the same depth as at present

_____ Continue existing journal subscriptions

_____ Continue existing journal subscriptions and add important new journals

_____ Agree not to withdraw any journal or continuation file in this field without notifying the CAMLS Office or Chairperson of the Library Resources Committee

_____ Notify the CAMLS Office or Chairperson of the Library Resources Committee if the Library can no longer continue to support the collection at the level stated above

_____ Respond to interlibrary loan requests in this area, to the normal extent

_____ Permit qualified and properly identified users of other member libraries to use the collection upon request of another library (privilege to be restricted to bona fide serious users)

_____ Respond on request to inquiries about holdings and orders from collection development librarians of member libraries, in order to avoid unnecessary Systemwide duplication of specialized and/or expensive holdings.

In return, a CAMLS Resource Library will receive the following:

1. Reciprocal privileges in other subject (or form) areas from other Resource Libraries

2. Avoidance of inappropriate referrals

3. Referral of suitable users; appropriate publicizing of collection

4. Referral to Resource Library of would-be donors of appropriate materials, collections, etc., from other libraries which are not attempting to collect in these fields

5. Offers of appropriate withdrawn materials (short runs of journals to fill in, etc.) from member libraries

6. Financial assistance in collection building, in the event that CAMLS receives funds at any future time for materials in sufficient amount to provide such assistance.

COMMENTS:

LIBRARY: _____

SIGNED BY: _____

DATE: _____

Appendix A-6 Sample form: CAMLS Information Sheet - Business Safari

CLEVELAND AREA METROPOLITAN LIBRARY SYSTEM

11000 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

DOROTHY SINCLAIR, *Executive Secretary*
Phone: (216) 368-2642

CAMLS INFORMATION SHEET

BUSINESS COLLECTIONS SAFARI

DATE _____

LIBRARY _____

MEMBER OCLC _____ YES _____ NO

CAMLS _____ YES _____ NO

CLASSIFICATION SCHEME _____ DEWEY _____ LC

_____ BOTH (Dates of use)

_____ OTHER

COLLECTION IS HOUSED:

_____ AS PART OF TOTAL COLLECTION IN MAIN LIBRARY

_____ IN DIVISIONAL UNIT OF MAIN LIBRARY

_____ IN REGIONAL OR BRANCH LIBRARY REMOVED FROM MAIN LIBRARY

LOCATION _____

CIRCULATION POLICY:

_____ DIRECT CIRCULATION TO ALL USERS OF CAMLS MEMBER LIBRARIES

_____ RESTRICTED TO INSTITUTION'S OWN CLIENTELE

_____ WILL PROCESS CAIN REQUESTS
PHOTOCOPY AVAILABLE _____ YES _____ NO
COST _____

_____ OTHER

COLLECTION STATISTICS - MATERIALS TO SERVE BUSINESS USERS -

MONOGRAPHS:

_____ TITLES (ESTIMATE)

_____ REFERENCE TITLES (ESTIMATE)

_____ CIRCULATING TITLES (ESTIMATE)

PERIODICALS

_____ TITLES HELD

_____ TITLES CURRENTLY RECEIVED

LOOSE LEAF SERVICES _____ (NOTE MAJOR SERVICES-USE VERSO)

INDEX/ ABSTRACT SERVICES HELD:

____ 1. Public Affairs Information Service
____ 2. Business Periodicals Index
____ 3. Science Citation Index
____ 4. Comprehensive Dissertation Index
____ 5. Mgmt Sci/Opr Res
____ 6. Social Science Citation Index
____ 7. Predicasts (list)
____ 8. Others

ON-LINE SEARCH CAPABILITY

LIST DATA BANKS PRESENTLY ACCESSIBLE:

1. 4.
2. 5.
3. 6.

LIST DATA BANKS TO WHICH USE IS ANTICIPATED:

1. 4.
2. 5.
3. 6.

SERVICE AVAILABLE TO OTHER THAN PRIMARY CLIENTELE? ____YES ____NO

CONTACT: _____

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX B

Sample Pages From Reports

Appendix B-1 Sample: Use of OCLC in Religion SAFARI Report

The field of Religion has been identified by the Resources Committee as a broad area of interest to users of CAMLS Libraries.

To aid in determination of current title acquisition in member libraries, CHOICE (Association of College and Research Libraries, American Library Association, volumes 12-13), April 1975 through April 1976, was checked against holdings. The OCLC terminal was used for OCLC members; card catalogs for non-members. This check of 262 titles in the area of Religion indicates that 224 titles, (85.5%) of those reviewed are held by member libraries.

HOLDINGS BY LIBRARY

% of sample		no. of titles
11.45	Baldwin-Wallace College	30
4.58	Cuyahoga Community College	12
6.87	Cleve. Hts-Univ. Hts.	18
17.18	Cleveland Public Library	45
22.90	Cleveland State University	60
23.28	Case Western Reserve Univ.	61
35.87	Cuyahoga County Public	94
2.87	East Cleveland Public	7
20.23	Euclid Public Library	53
46.56	John Carroll University	122
13.36	Lakewood Public Library	35
24.05	Oberlin College	63
26.34	St. Mary Seminary	69
6.87	Shaker Heights Public	18

UNIQUE HOLDINGS

library	number
JCU	19
OB	9
CY	5
CWRU	4
CSU	3
St.M	3
BW	1
CCC	1
CPL	1
EPL	1
TOTAL	47

CLEVELAND SCHOOLS - HISTORY - CPL

CURRICULUM GUIDES - CHRH(CHRH School Districts), ND(National)

CURRICULUM MATERIALS - BW, CSU, JCU, ND

DISSERTATIONS - CWRU

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION - CEC (Metro), CHRH

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION - BW, CCPL-MH, CPL, CSU, ND

ERIC INDEX ONLY - CPL, CWRU, JCU

ERIC REPORTS - BW (197a -m), CSU

EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN - CHRH

FOREIGN EDUCATION - CWRU

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING - CWRU, JCU

HIGHER EDUCATION - CSU, CWRU

HISTORY OF EDUCATION - CWRU

LEARNING DISABILITIES - JCU

NEWSLETTERS - CSU

PSYCHOLOGY, EDUCATIONAL - CSU

READING AND READING DISABILITIES - BW

READING METHODS (ELEMENTARY) - CPL

SCHOLARSHIPS - CPL

SCHOOL INFORMATION (PRIVATE, VOCATIONAL, CORRESPONDENCE) - CPL

SECONDARY EDUCATION - CSU, JCU

SPECIAL EDUCATION - CPL, CWRU

STUDY ABROAD - CPL

TEXTBOOKS- BW, CSU, JCU, ND (CHRH has lists of those used in CHRH School Districts)

THEORY, EDUCATIONAL - CWRU

THESES - CWRU, JCU

URBAN EDUCATION - CPL

VOCATIONAL INFORMATION (STATE STUDIES) - CHRH

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY, SEARS LIBRARY

10900 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

REFERENCE: 368-4346

SCIAC: CWR Since 1972

BUSINESS COLLECTION: Monographs: 24,770 titles of which 240 are reference

Periodicals: 518 titles currently received

Additional relevant materials housed at Freiberger and other CWRU libraries.

SUBJECT EMPHASIS: Accounting
Automation
Bibliography
Economics
Finance
Management
Operations Research
Organizational Behavior

CIRCULATION POLICY: CWRU community, Clientele of NOCHE libraries, Authorized borrowers, Faculty and Graduate Students of OCLC institutions in Ohio.

PHOTOCOPY: Available. COST: on site .10/exposure
ILL .15/exposure, plus $.50 handling charge.

ON-LINE SEARCH CAPABILITY: Data Base available: Lockheed, DIC.
Contact: Mrs. Lacey

REMARKS: Private university. Grants MBA, PhD's in Management, Organizational Behavior, Operations Research. Emphasis is on bibliographic needs, serial publications, and a good retrospective monographic collection. Partial U.S. Government Depository since 1910. Collection of foundation and non-profit corporation annual reports.

Appendix B-4 Sample: Library Profile (Core Music Unit)

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY (CSU)

Music collection is housed within Division of Main Library

COLLECTION:

Total volumes	6,000
Reference books	150
Circulating books	5,250
Scores	3,750
Current journal titles	110
Sheet music	0

RECORDINGS:

Music phonorecords	3,250
Juvenile phonorecords (in vols)	60
Cassettes	2,250
Reel-to-reel tapes	140

CIRCULATION POLICY:

Will circulate on process (non-library use) for books, scores, phonorecords, and reel-to-reel tapes; reference books, music journals and cassettes are restricted to in-library use; juvenile phonorecords (largely music education sets) are restricted to CSU students.

CLASSIFICATION:

LC

HOURS:

(ARE A / DATE, ETC)

SUBJECT STRENGTHS:

Individual editions and ensembles
Electronic music (permanent resource of books, scores and recordings)
Jazz
Music education (including several large media instructional kits)
Music history, especially Twentieth century
Theory and composition

SPECIAL FEATURES:

Collection of music of John Cage
Contemporary Hi-Lo music collection (some 500 scores, 150 tapes, including various Festival) Recordings)

REFERENCE service; microfiche collection (with cooperation) of some 200 American Music newspapers indexed by bimonthly issues of the Bird, which includes music, fine arts, and architecture.

CUYAHOGA COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY - FAIRVIEW PARK REGIONAL LIBRARY

4449 West 213th Street
Fairview Park, Ohio 44126

333-8772

NAME OF IN-HOUSE REFERENCE PERSON:

Barbara Musselman
Gary Clarton

HOURS: M-F (9-9) Sat-Sun (1-5)

CIRCULATION POLICY:

PHOTOCOPY: 10¢/page

COLLECTION STATISTICS:

MONOGRAPHS 800

NON-CIRCULATING 250

CIRCULATING 250

ARTIFACTS

GENEALOGICAL TITLES 250

EARLY MAPS

PHOTOGRAPHS

CLIPPING FILE Press, Plain Dealer

MANUSCRIPTS:

CENSUS OR OTHER MICROFILM HOLDINGS:

Many printed or microfilm early census reports for Ohio and eastern states.
City Directories
Vast collection of 19th century County and State Histories (10 drawers)

PUBLIC RECORDS:

Some legal material
Geological Survey 1873-83
N.J. Patents and Deeds 1661-1703
Official Roster of Ohio Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines (25 vol.)
Colonial Records of New Amsterdam (9 vol.)

PERTINENT PERIODICAL HOLDINGS:

West-Life
Sun-Herald
Extensive journal holdings for genealogy

SPECIAL HOLDINGS OR AREAS OF CONCENTRATION:

Parish History
Quaker Material
City Directories 1870+

GUIDE OF HOLDINGS PERTINENT TO GENEALOGY OR LOCAL HISTORY USERS:

Genealogical Research: A Selected List of Materials (1975)
Beginning Genealogy: A Bibliography (1977)

Appendix B-6 Sample: Library Profile from Religion SAFARI

BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE RITTER LIBRARY

Berea, Ohio 44017 Reference: 826-2206

OCLC: OXB 1975

Religion (Methodist) Collection: Monographs: 2,500 titles

Periodicals: 10 titles held

2 currently received

Circulation Policy: Restricted to institution's clientele. Will process CAMLS/CAIN requests.

Photocopy: 10¢/page.

Collection Statement:

The United Methodist Historical Collection (housed in the Philura Gould Baldwin Library) is composed of approximately 2,500 volumes on every aspect of Methodism. With only a few missing volumes, it contains journals of annual conferences from as early as 1796. Many old volumes of the Methodist Review and other such publications are also present. The Collection belongs to the East Ohio Conference of the United Methodist Church.

The Collection is jointly administered by Ritter Library and the Executive Committee of the Archives Commission of the East Ohio Conference of the United Methodist Church.

The Commission is using the term Archives Center to include books, periodicals, and other artifacts in the collection.

The Collection has recently become the center for the Evangelical United Brethren archives since its merger with the Methodist Church.

Ritter Library has an excellent slide-film and cassette series on the Dead Sea Scrolls, which may be borrowed.

CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY - MAIN (CPL)

COLLECTION: Circulating - 20,000
Reference - 30,600
Journals - 180

LEND TO: Public

AV: Micro-media, reader-printer

CAIN: Yes

CLASSIFICATION: Modified Dewey and LC

DEPOSITORY: Full - integrated, full UNESCO

ERIC: No - Index only

OCLC: Yes

SUBJECT SPECIALTIES:
ADULT EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FILE
ALUMNI MAGAZINES
CAREER INFORMATION
CLEVELAND SCHOOLS - HISTORY
COLLEGE CATALOGS (CURRENT AND RETROSPECTIVE)
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION
FOREIGN CATALOGS
READING METHODS (ELEMENTARY)
SCHOLARSHIP INFORMATION
SCHOOL INFORMATION (PRIVATE, VOCATIONAL, CORRESPONDENCE)
SPECIAL EDUCATION
STUDY ABROAD
SUMMER CAMP INFORMATION
URBAN EDUCATION

SPECIAL FEATURES:
AUTHOR INDEX TO VERTICAL FILE
RETROSPECTIVE COLLECTION

NOTES:

LAKEWOOD PUBLIC LIBRARY (LPL)

Music collection is housed in Fine Arts division within main collection

COLLECTION:

Total volumes	2,745
Reference books	145
Circulating books	1,400
Scores	1,200
Current journal titles	2
Sheet music	0

RECORDINGS:

Music phonorecords	4,800
Juvenile phonorecords	650
Cassettes	0
Reel-to-reel tapes	0

CIRCULATION POLICY:
Reference materials are restricted to in-library use; other materials are available for direct loan to patrons of CAMLS libraries or through inter-library loan.

CLASSIFICATION:
Dewey

MEMBER:
CAMLS /CAIN, OCLC

SUBJECT STRENGTHS:
Popular music

REMARKS:
Lakewood Public Library was not visited on the safari, but its librarian shared this information with the safari participants.

SPECIAL STRENGTHS IN AREA HOLDINGS

(based on survey April-June 1977)

Black History	AAHCS, CAP, CPL (King Branch), CSU, WRHS
British Local History	CPL
British Parish Records	CPL
Census Holdings	CY-FP, LPL, WRHS
Civil War	WRHS
Clipping File	CPL, CPR, CWRU, CY-NO, ECP, PD, WRHS
County or State Histories	CY-FP, WRHS
Directories	CPL, CY-FP, ECP, LPL, WRHS
Dutch Sources	CY-FP
Ethnic Sources	CSU, CWRU
German Sources	CPL, WRHS
Heraldry	CPL, WRHS
Indexes to Newspapers	CPL, CSU, LPL, WRHS
Jewish History	TUC, WRHS
Journals	CPL, CSU, CY-FP, LPL, WRHS
Local History Files	BWC, CY-BR, ECP, LPL
Manuscripts	WRHS
Maps (Platt-Books, etc.)	CPL, CSU, CY-OF, LPL, WRHS
Medical History	CHSL
Monographs	CPL, CY-FP, LPL, WRHS
Municipal Records	CML, CSU, WRHS
Necrology File	CPL, PD, WRHS
Oral History	CY-BR, CY-PA, Porter Public Library
Passenger/Immigration Lists	WRHS

Periodical Indexes	CSU, CY-NO, CY-NR
Photographs	AAHCS, CHSL, CPL, CPR, CWRU, CY-CF, LPL, PD, WRHS
Public Records	CY-NO, CY-NR, WRHS
Quaker Sources	CY-FP
Realty Holdings	CY-BP
Religious Bodies	Baptist (WRHS), Evan. U. Brethren (BWC), Methodist (BWC), Shakers (WRHS)

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The music safari participants first met on April 26,1976 to plan an itinerary and devise a strategy for evaluation of Cleveland Area music collections. Armed with the good advice offered by members of the Education Safari Team, we planned to visit the seven music libraries on three days; June 16,18 and 21, with a wrap-up meeting on the 25th. This schedule proved to be quite satisfactory.

The Safari Team included Katharine Owen and J.W.Coffman (Mayfield Regional), Karen Miller and Pam Schlenk (Cleveland Institute of Music), Sonia Solomonoff (Case Western Reserve University), Elinore Barber and Janet Winzenburger (Baldwin-Wallace), John Druesedow (Oberlin), Kathleen Shamp (Cleveland Public), Carolyn Mateer and Dan Shell (Cleveland State), Eugene Hatch (Lakewood Public), and Helene Stern (Cleveland Hts.-University Hts.). Elaine Druesedow (Oberlin) was the representative from the CAMLS Library Resources Committee.

The Cleveland Institute of Music, although not a member of CAMLS, was invited to participate. The institute's librarian, as well as other Safari members benefitted from its inclusion, and we would recommend that special non-member libraries continue to be invited to participate in subject safaris.

Also, Helene Stern and Eugene Hatch wished to join in the safari, even though their libraries were not visited. An invitation to librarians with a subject interest in the safari should be extended, whether or not the library is on the itinerary.

Advised to have some objective criteria for measurement of collections, participating libraries filled out information sheets giving collection statistics, circulation policies, and collection emphases. A music reference checklist and a collected editions and monumenta checklist was used to give some idea of the scope and depth of the collection. Another effort at objective evaluation was the assignment of a particular subject area to each safari participant. Comparative judgments were made about the strength of that subject area by testing certain subject headings, composers, shelf areas, etc. in each of the seven libraries. Subject areas included music history, music reference materials, theory and composition, twentieth century, music education, instrumental and vocal music, ethnomusicology and folk music, popular music, and recordings. Reports on each topic were the basis of our wrap-up meeting. It was quite a successful approach, and we would heartily recommend it to future safaris.

The safari was undertaken with a good deal of enthusiasm, and members were treated to some rewarding moments, such as viewing the rare vault items at Baldwin-Wallace's Riemenschneider Bach Institute, or discovering unexpected caches such as the contemporary Polish music, John Cage, and electronic music collections at Cleveland State University, and the Ohio folk music collection at Baldwin-Wallace. We admired the carefully prepared indexes to song books, hymnals, instrumental anthologies, and Cleveland Orchestra programs the the Cleveland Public Library, and enjoyed the demonstration of the Fine Arts section of the NEWSBANK at Mayfield Regional.

In each of the libraries we found that the collections strongly reflected the academic programs or clientele of the institution. The conservatory collections at Cleveland Institute of Music and Oberlin Conservatory reflect a strong performance emphasis with score and parts collections, and a higher ratio of scores to monographs.

Case Western Reserve, on the other hand, concentrates on music history and education materials to support its programs. Cleveland State, as a newer institution, has chosen to focus on twentieth century materials and music education, although it is quickly building a strong music research collection. And although the public libraries have good general music collections, and do not rank popular music as their top collection emphasis, we must rely on them to fill the need for these materials in the Cleveland area.

A dominant theme which recurs in such collection studies as this one is that cooperative efforts work to everyone's benefit. The various special emphases so nicely complement each other, and no library, which must first support the needs of its own clientele, could hope to approach the diversity and depth of the total Cleveland area collections.

A sense of comaraderie developed among safari participants, which promises to enhance cooperative service in the area. The music librarians agreed to hold periodic meetings to share ideas on common concerns and to maintain some awareness about developments in each other's collections. The safari members benefitted considerably from the project, and we hope that some measure of this experience can be shared with CAMLS libraries through this summary report.

SAFARI VI

"SAFARI" (Site Appraisal For Area Resources Inventory) is the designation given to a technique CAMLS is using for collection study. Identification of topics for collection study is the responsibility of the Library Resources Committee. Specialist librarians, those who serve users and those who are in charge of collection development in the designated subject areas, are identified. This group plans and carries out the SAFARI. A document, providing library profiles for each participating library and bibliographic information in the subject field studied, is prepared and published by CAMLS.

The Nursing SAFARI Team approached this SAFARI Report differently, because of the unique aspects of the subject. In order to discover which libraries contained nursing materials, an information sheet was distributed to sixty-seven libraries, including all of the CAMLS members. From the fifty-six replies a great deal of information was discovered. A majority of the relevant materials is housed in libraries, primarily in hospitals, which must limit their usage or circulation to specific patrons. As a result, even though a library has an excellent collection, the materials might not be accessible to the public. Often interlibrary loan is possible, although this seems to depend on the requesting library and on cost variations. It was decided by the entire SAFARI Team that little value would be gained from visiting the few libraries which have collections that are accessible to the general public. Furthermore, the Team concluded that stating subject strengths was not pertinent, since nursing itself is viewed as a strength. Although this document is not a SAFARI in the strictest meaning of the term, an inventory of resources in Cleveland area libraries was made.

The profiles which follow were derived from the information sheets, which were returned to the CAMLS Office. Only those institutions which indicated owning any nursing items are listed. The data that are included were deemed by the Committee to be the most vital for using nursing materials, especially the circulation and interlibrary loan policies. Since few libraries have any special nursing collections, the topic was listed only when applicable. The part entitled 'Journals' gives one of two possible places that can be checked for a library's holdings; the Biomedical Serials* publication and Addendum A of the SAFARI Report. If a library has participated in Biomedical Serials, that statement is indicated on the profile. For those libraries not listed on Biomedical Serials, journal holdings are included at the

* Biomedical Serials in Metropolitan Cleveland is a union list of the serials' holdings of fifty-three libraries. The third edition was published in 1975, and one supplement was issued in May, 1977. All participants should have a copy of Biomedical Serials, and work is proceeding on another edition. Anyone wishing further information on the new edition can contact the Cleveland Health Sciences Library around the middle of 1978, at which time the updated version should be near completion.

end of this document as Addendum A. The SAFARI Team felt that a standard bibliography, International Nursing Index, should be used as the basis for listing journals.

The SAFARI Team hopes that this document will foster interlibrary cooperation in the field of Nursing.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE NURSING SAFARI

Mary Dalzell
Reference Department
Cleveland State University Library

Dr. Stephan Hilliard
Biology Department
Baldwin-Wallace College

Mary Krichbaum
Medical Library
Huron Road Hospital

Lucille Lang
Fairview Park Public Library

Susan Lauffer
Medical Library
Fairview General Hospital

Gerry Mink
recently retired from Cleveland
Health Sciences Library

Gretchen Redfield
Title II-B Project Director
CAMLS Office

Elizabeth Stein
Brittingham Memorial Library
Cleveland Metropolitan General Hospital

SAFARI PUBLICATIONS

SAFARI I - Education
published April, 1976

SAFARI II - Music
published September, 1976

SAFARI III - Business
published April, 1977

SAFARI IV - Local History and Genealogy
published June, 1977

SAFARI V - Religion
published June, 1977

SAFARI VI - Nursing
published December, 1977

CLEVELAND HEALTH SCIENCES LIBRARY

HOURS: 8:00 - 11:00 Monday - Friday
9:00 - 5:00 Saturday
12:00 - 11:00 Sunday

2119 Abington Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

CIRCULATION POLICY:

The library is open to the public, but borrowing privileges are limited to Case Western Reserve students, faculty, staff and members of the Cleveland Medical Library Association.

REFERENCE PHONE NUMBER: 368-3218

CONTACT PERSON: Nancy Burrell

REFERENCE POLICY:

Limited "quick" reference. Extensive searching is restricted to Cleveland Medical Library Association members and faculty, staff and students of Case Western Reserve. Others can receive reference on a fee-for-service basis.

CLASSIFICATION(S): National Library of Medicine, Library of Congress and some older volumes in Dewey

SUBJECT HEADINGS USED: MeSH

COLLECTION:

Number of Volumes in Nursing 30,000

MEMBERSHIPS:

Medical Library Association
Cleveland Medical Library Association
OCLC CAMLS
Northeast Ohio Major Academic Libraries
Kentucky-Ohio-Michigan Regional Medical Libraries

ON-LINE SERVICES AVAILABLE:

Medline Sociological Abstracts
Psychological Abstracts

One free Medline search per year for faculty and students of Case Western Reserve - three Medline searches for members of Cleveland Medical Library Association. All of the data bases are available to others on a fee-for-service basis.

CONTACT PERSON: Nancy Burrell or Frederica Boice (368-3640)

CLEVELAND HEALTH SCIENCES LIBRARY

(CONT.)

ILL POLICY:

Loans may be obtained through a public library. Photocopying is available in the library.

ABSTRACTS AND INDEXES:

International Nursing Index
Dissertation Abstracts International
Sociological Abstracts
Psychological Abstracts
Current Contents (Life Sciences and Clinical Practice)
Nursing and Allied Health Index (Formerly Cumulative Index to Nursing Literature)
Index Medicus
Nutrition Abstracts and Reviews
Hospital Literature Index

JOURNALS:

Please refer to Biomedical Serials list

AUDIO-VISUAL COLLECTIONS:

Restricted primarily to the students of Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS:

Theses: The library has all of the theses from the students who graduated from the Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing. It also keeps several lists of theses from other schools of nursing.

Helena McMillan Historical Nursing Collection:
Includes early nursing development, nursing school development, nursing during World Wars I and II, and historical textbooks.

The library also has a Florence Nightingale collection which contains a few original letters and photostats, biographies, addresses and reports.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

PART IV. PROGRAM NARRATIVE

1. OBJECTIVES AND NEED FOR THIS ASSISTANCE

Basic Objectives:

1. Development and testing of a method for involving librarians, faculty, library users, governing bodies in the study of collections of cooperating public and academic libraries.
2. Development of agreed-upon statements among some or all of the 19 libraries comprising the Metropolitan Library System of the Library Council of Greater Cleveland, in which responsibility is accepted for collecting in depth for the benefit of the entire system.

Contributory Objectives:

1. Determination of the extent of duplication, overlapping, and unmet needs in the area, through a sampling of holdings and use of the data base of the Ohio College Library Center;
2. Development of awareness of the totality of regional holdings in some 7-10 subject areas among librarians, governing bodies, and major users of the libraries, especially university and college faculty members;
3. Removal of negative attitudes among the above group(s) to the extent that a significant number of them will work togehher in task forces to prepare (1) Comparative statements of existing resources in the area, by topic and sub-topic, and (2) Preliminary plans for assignment of subject responsibility

for in-depth collection among the libraries;

4. Dissemination of the information gained through the project, if successful, to appropriate library, academic, and government groups.

Rationale:

Libraries in metropolitan areas contain a wide variety of materials, assembled to meet the needs of the libraries' several clienteles. It has long been recognized that such collections may be shared through interlibrary loan, to the benefit of a large group of information users. It is scarcely necessary to document the above statement; library literature abounds with evidence. To give one or two examples:

> "If we make the choice to spend our library dollars in behalf of self-sufficiency we will demonstrably be spending more and more money for less and less goods and services. If the choice is for self-sufficiency then it must be based on a sounder reason than maintaining the status quo. To attempt to have both running in parallel is like trying to have a dialectic of thesis and antithesis without even attempting a synthesis. To assume that the staus quo has its own rewards - as if it were a virtue - is to assume that the environment never changes." (1)

> "Early formulation of the problem that the Ohio College Library Center is to solve had occurred in a general way before the Center became a corporate entity. Put succintly, the problem to be solved was one of increasing resources to Ohio colleges and universities. From the college administrative point of view, the problem was that of hiring new faculty and enrolling new students in the future. Presidents of Ohio academic institutions were particularly aware that new Ph.D.'s are research-oriented. If these younger men are not offered an opportunity to pursue research programs, they are reluctant to join a faculty. Moreover, changing educational objectives in colleges are requiring that undergraduates have an increasing opportunity to learn how to learn. Such opportunities can best be given to a student by providing him with resources for independent work." (2)

Many systems and consortia, including the Metropolitan Library System of the Library Council of Greater Cleveland, have been formed to develop methods for such sharing along with other cooperative activities.

It is relatively easy to share, and to do so with a degree of effectiveness. Much more difficult is the agreement to SELECT and ACQUIRE materials on a planned and shared basis, so as to increase the total resources available to the entire region. Such planned acquisition, however, represents a logical corollary to the original interlibrary lending.

Ruth Patrick, writing in 1972 of academic library consortia only, noted that "...cooperative development of resources...is being undertaken by only a small number of consortia," and pointed out that "Further research is definitely needed in the economics of developing library resources in a cooperative way." (3)

Possible reasons for the difficulty in achieving what, at first glance, appears to be a manifestly desirable end may be identified: (1) Previous value systems; (2) Standards; (3) Unfortunate experience; and (4) Unspoken and unfounded apprehensions. Previous value systems tended to equate success and prestige in library management with the size and self-sufficiency of an institution. Standards normally call for unrealistic collection of infrequently consulted materials. Such standards are utilized in many instances by surveyors and accrediting bodies. Unfortunate experience with a poorly-planned cooperative effort, and especially with one utilizing inadequate communication and delivery systems, may well have led librarians and administrators to adopt a negative attitude. Unspoken and unfounded apprehensions usually take the form of fear of loss of autonomy, fear of parasitic use of one's own resources by the clientele of cooperating institutions, fear that an agreement will preclude the retention and support of even a general

working collection in fields assigned to another institution. (4)

The barriers suggested in the preceding paragraph are chiefly, and intentionally, behavioral in nature. Much research has been funded to develop data bases and other sophisticated means of cooperation among libraries. The tools exist, to a large extent. "The obstacles to resource sharing are no longer inherent in technology, but in people." (5)

To quote Fetterman again:

> "It would be a serious mistake to think that all forces in the library field are pushing in the direction of sharing of resources. There remains a great deal of pressure to maintain and even develop greater self-sufficiency. Sharing among libraries involves many formalities. There are delays, costs, and the problems associated with having one's own request subordinated to that of the home library." (6)

> "From a purely human point of view one of the primary administrative tasks is to create an atmosphere of willingness on the part of the participants. The librarians affected by the projects should be involved in the planning phases as early as possible." (7)

Not only librarians, but also library users, may need to undergo a change of attitude. Prominent among such hard-to-convince users are the faculty members of academic institutions.

> "First, I must say that in the many visits I have made to campuses, one of the most vivid impressions I retain is that libraries are the most underutilized resource. Nevertheless, almost every faculty member wants a self-sufficient library on his or her campus. The unreasonableness of faculty expectations (and often demands) is probably all too familiar to most.

But it is one of the realities of the situation, and you will miss an opportunity if you fail to educate faculty about the importance of resource sharing and enlist their support. You will note that I make no mention of students in my remarks chiefly because they usually reflect the attitudes of their professors. Occasionally students have valuable insights to add to our thinking about libraries, but they cannot begin to match the professional expertise of their teachers.

Faculty members, and occasionally students, sit on library committees in many institutions, and more than one librarian has found himself a minority of one in trying to introduce broader approaches to library planning and development against the implacable opposition of faculty self-interest. Somehow, we must do a better job of educating our faculties, all faculties, about the wastefulness of stockpiling low-use materials and the futility of even the most affluent libraries trying to achieve anything like complete collections of all the important journals and periodicals." (8)

Today's economic stresses are well known. Central cities are in a particularly difficult situation, confronting simultaneously a population in need of expensive services and an eroding tax base. The plight of private colleges and universities is equally serious; unless substantial endowments exist, rising costs must be met with desperation economy measures, often making serious inroads on library budgets. Few libraries of any type can purchase the resources they were able to add five years ago.

Two widely-used sources of comparative prices make the problem clear. The 1975 Bowker Annual shows the rise in cost of monographs. (9)

	1967/69	1974
Price of Average Hardcover Book	$8.77	$14.09

The Publishers Weekly's annual price index, using 100 for 1969, rises to 160.7 in 1974.

Thus, cooperation takes on a more urgent aspect. When the problem is to curtail resources where it will hurt the least, it becomes more apparent that such paring of acquisitions is best accomplished in concert with library neighbors. If cooperation will not, in today's economy, enrich the total resources of a region, it can at least assist libraries to maintain, jointly, their former level of available resources through careful planning.

A critical area in acquisitions during periods of budget curtailment is that of substantial monographs. Such materials, not necessarily called for heavily by large numbers of users, nevertheless represent the information backbone of a collection for the serious user of the public library and the undergraduate student. Such titles maintain their usefulness, as a rule, over a long period of time. Unfortunately, it is in provision of these monographs that libraries frequently are forced to economize. City libraries, seeking to make libraries more useful to the urban poor, are spending more for audio-visual materials and specialized resources for the semi-literate. Large university libraries, making the hard choice to continue their journal subscriptions and maintain their research collections, may also have to reduce their acquisition of substantial monographs. It is hard to quarrel with these decisions, but the loss of such information to an entire metropolitan area is serious. Upward-bound minority students, minority seekers of information, and minority business persons may be among the sufferers from this lack. Undergraduates who will be the future research community are denied important information. In short,

the groups in whose interest curtailment of acquisitions of monographs is made may suffer in the long run. It is the contention of the co-operating libraries of the Cleveland area that wise planning in co-operative acquisition may prevent or ameliorate such curtailment.

This proposal describes a plan for designing such cooperation, in a series of phases which have as their objectives: (1) Providing evidence both of gaps in total regional collections and of widespread duplication; (2) Convincing both the purveyors and users of information that cooperation is both desirable and feasible, by involving them in the study, and (3) Developing specific plans, again involving both user and institutional personnel, for sharing of responsibilities for collection building in assigned areas among the region's libraries. The plan requires agreements to make resources available, and to disseminate the information obtained to other systems and consortia of libraries through publications, presentations, and other appropriate means.

The Metropolitan Library System of Greater Cleveland is qualified to undertake this project through experience in cooperation, through availability of necessary expertise, and through its existing effective interlibrary loan communication and delivery system. The availability of the Ohio College Library Center, of which a majority of the system's libraries are members, is a tremendous advantage in checking holdings, so that laborious checking of catalogs is no longer necessary except in a few instances. The membership in the Library Council of Greater Cleveland of the School of Library Science of Case Western Reserve University assures the availability of both faculty and student assistance.

Members of the system, as of December 1975, are as follows:

Baldwin-Wallace College
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland Health Sciences Library
Cleveland Heights-University Heights Public Library
Cleveland Public Library
Cleveland State University
Cuyahoga Community College
Cuyahoga County Public Library
East Cleveland Public Library
Euclid Public Library
John Carroll University
Lakewood Public Library
Oberlin College
Porter Public Library
Rocky River Public Library
St. Mary Seminary
School of Library Science, CWRU
Shaker Heights Public Library
Willoughby-Eastlake Public Library.

The system has the advantage also of a partial body of data gained through current and previous interlibrary lending activity. This information, combined with that to be gathered through the proposed study, appears to be generalizable, so that information gained would be of value in other metropolitan areas. While each such area is, of course, unique, the combination in Cleveland of a large public library, a suburban complex of county and city libraries, a large state university, a large private university with strong professional schools, a county community college, and several small and medium-sized liberal arts colleges operating under private auspices is a pattern which, with minor changes, could be replicated in most large metropolitan areas in the United States.

NOTES

1. John Fetterman, "Resource Sharing in Libraries - Why?" in Allen Kent, ed. Resource Sharing in Libraries: Why, How, When, Next Action Steps. (N.Y.: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1974), p. 8.

2. Frederick G. Kilgour. "Initial System for the Ohio College Library Center: A Case History," in Proceedings of the 1968 Clinic in Library Applications of Data Processing. (Dewey E. Carroll, ed.), (Urbana: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1969), pp. 81-82.

3. Ruth A. Patrick. Guidelines for Library Cooperation: Development of Academic Library Consortia. (Santa Monica: System Development Corporation, 1972), p. 172.

4. Another more complex listing of barriers, which begins with psychological and behavioral ones, was developed by a series of regional meetings sponsored by the American Library Association in 1968. These are listed in Fetterman, Op. cit., p.13-14.

5. Ibid., p. 12.

6. Ibid., p. 8.

7. Ibid., p. 7.

8. Robert Kirkwood. "Resource Sharing and Accreditation," in Allen Kent, ed. Resource Sharing in Libraries: Why, How, When, Next Action Steps. (N.Y.: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1974), p. 52.

9. Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information. 20th ed., 1975. (N.Y.: Bowker, 1975), p. 180.